REMARKS

The Office Action of January 5, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

An RCE is being filed concurrently to relieve this application of its finally-rejected status.

Figure 3 of the present application's drawings illustrates an important feature disclosed by the application. A CPU is switched over from low speed operation (during a halt mode) to high speed operation (during an active or operational mode) while the oscillation of the high speed oscillator is stabilizing. Letting the high speed oscillator stabilize as the switch-over from the halt mode to the operational mode progresses speeds up the switch-over period.

The present Amendment revises claim 1 to recite that "stabilization of oscillation of the second clock proceeds as the central processing unit is preparing for the interruption." The Amendment adds a similar limitation to the other independent claims. Furthermore, dependent claim 12 is being cancelled and its subject matter is being added to independent claim 8. New dependent claims 21-24 are being added to specifically recite that switching from the halt mode to the operational mode takes place while stabilization of the second (or high-speed) clock is proceeding.

The Office Action rejects the claims for anticipation by patent 6,219,797 to Liu et al (which will hereafter be called simply "Liu"). For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the inventions now defined by the independent claims are patentable over this reference.

AMENDMENT   7   10/084,348

Claim 1 recites that a start signal causes "the central processing unit to start preparation for the interruption and additionally causing the clock generation circuit to start producing the second clock while the central processing unit is starting preparation for the interruption, so that stabilization of oscillation of the second clock proceeds as the central processing unit is preparing for the interruption." The Office Action draws attention to Liu's Figure 5 and to the passage at column 13 of the reference, lines 31-36. However, an ordinarily skilled person would likely conclude that the passage cited in the Office Action only advises that hardware or software can be used to change the effective clock speed after an interrupt occurs. Nothing is said in the reference about the <u>timing</u> of when this change in clock speed occurs. The reference neither discloses nor suggests starting a clock generating circuit that produces a second clock at a time that permits stabilization of the second clock to proceed as a central processing unit is preparing for an interruption.

Independent claims 8, 17, and 18 also provide that stabilization of a second clock proceeds as a CPU (or central processing means) prepares for an interruption. Accordingly, these claims are patentable over the Liu reference for reasons along the lines discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Since the remaining claims depend from independent claims and recite additional limitations to further define the invention, they are patentable along with their independent claims and need not be further discussed. It is nevertheless noted that new dependent claims 21-24 specifically provide that switching from a halt mode to an operational mode takes place while stabilization of oscillation of a second clock is proceeding.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen Wood
Registration No. 28,134
Customer No. 23995
(202) 326-0222
(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)
(202) 408-5297 (facsimile)

AW:rw